

Appl. No. 10/669,673
Reply Filed: August 3, 2007
Reply to Office Action of: May 3, 2007

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action of August 11, 2006, the Applicant submits this Reply. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, reconsideration is requested.

Claims 21-24 and 27 remain in this application, of which claims 21 and 27 are independent. No fee is due for claims for this amendment. In the Office Action, the remaining claims were rejected.

The rejection of claims 1-20 and 25-26 is moot in view of the cancellation of these claims.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 17, 21-24 and 27, of which claims 21 and 27 are independent, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of *Balabanovic* and U.S. Patent 6,366,296 ("Boreczky"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

According to *Balabanovic*, a "multimedia story creation and playback system" [para. 0014] has a display component that "allows a user to navigate through the objects in storage" [para. 0025]. In particular, this navigation:

"may include being able to browse through raw objects (e.g. objects without narrations associated or attached thereto), browse through stories, and play back previously created stories. In one embodiment, playing back a story involves showing the user a slideshow of images along with any accompanying narrations."

Also according to *Balabanovic*, this system has an "interaction component [which] allows the user to create new stories." *Balabanovic*, para. 0026.

The Office Action indicates that *Balabanovic* does not expressly disclose the limitations of "comparing of the metadata of each scene with the metadata of the currently exhibited media asset" and "displaying to the user an indication of relevance of the currently exhibited digital media asset to at least one of the scenes according to a result of the comparison."

According to *Boreczky*, "a media browser includes a feature indicator that provides information related to a corresponding selected feature based on a corresponding confidence score." *Boreczky*, col. 2, lines 20-25. *Boreczky* also states the "providing feature information in

Appl. No. 10/669,673
Reply Filed: August 3, 2007
Reply to Office Action of: May 3, 2007

a media browsing system can be very useful for a user when identifying areas of interest in a media file, controlling media playback, editing a media file or performing other operations with a media file.” *Boreczky*, col. 1, lines 60-64. The Final Office Action refers to one kind of feature indicator, a shot boundary. In particular, “[o]nce metadata regarding the shot boundary feature is determined, information can be provide to a suer to aid the user in locating portions of interest in the media filc. . .”. *Boreczky*, col. 3, lines 56-60.

There is no teaching or suggestion in either reference of “comparing the metadata of each scene with the meta data of the currently selected media asset” and “displaying . . . an indication of relevance of the currently exhibited digital media asset to at least one of the scenes according to a result of the comparison.” For example, if the claimed “metadata of the currently selected media asset” is deemed to correspond to *Boreczky*’s “shot boundaries”, then *Boreczky* does not compare this meta data to the meta data of each scene, as required by the claims.

While the Final Office Action correctly points out that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually, in this instance *neither reference teaches the claim limitations*. Therefore, the combination of the teachings of these references *cannot* teach these claim limitations. At best, *Boreczky* might suggest that media files in *Balabanovic* be analyzed to extract features and to display feature indicators. Such a modification to *Balabanovic* would not result in the claimed “comparing the metadata of each scene with the meta data of the currently selected media asset” and “displaying . . . an indication of relevance of the currently exhibited digital media asset to at least one of the scenes according to a result of the comparison.”

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 21 and 27 is traversed. The remaining dependent claims 22-24 are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Appl. No. 10/669,673
Reply Filed: August 3, 2007
Reply to Office Action of: May 3, 2007


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this reply, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, please charge any fee to **Deposit Account No. 50-0876**.

Respectfully submitted,

Avid Technology, Inc.

By 
Peter J. Gordon
Registration No. 35,164
Avid Technology, Inc.
One Park West
Tewksbury, MA 01876
Tel.: (978) 640-6789
August 3, 2007